

Gillmor  
Gingrey  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Goss  
Granger  
Graves  
Green (WI)  
Greenwood  
Gutknecht  
Hall  
Harris  
Hart  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Hyde  
Isakson  
Issa  
Istook  
Janklow  
Jenkins  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (NC)  
Keller  
Kelly  
Kennedy (MN)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
Kline  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
LaHood  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Leach  
Lewis (CA)

Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
LoBiondo  
Lucas (OK)  
Manzullo  
McCotter  
McCrery  
McHugh  
McKeon  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Moran (KS)  
Murphy  
Musgrave  
Myrick  
Nethercutt  
Neugebauer  
Ney  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nunes  
Nussle  
Osborne  
Ose  
Otter  
Oxley  
Paul  
Pearce  
Pence  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Pombo  
Porter  
Portman  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Ramstad  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Renzi  
Reynolds  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)

Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Royce  
Ryan (WI)  
Ryun (KS)  
Shaw  
Shays  
Sherwood  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simmons  
Simpson  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Souders  
Stearns  
Sullivan  
Sweeney  
Tancredo  
Tauzin  
Taylor (NC)  
Terry  
Thomas  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Toomey  
Turner (OH)  
Upton  
Vitter  
Walden (OR)  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wolf  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

Oberstar  
Obey  
Oliver  
Ortiz  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Peterson (MN)  
Pomeroy  
Price (NC)  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reyes  
Rodriguez  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Rush

Ryan (OH)  
Sabo  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sanders  
Sandlin  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Serrano  
Sherman  
Skelton  
Snyder  
Solis  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stenholm  
Strickland  
Stupak  
Tanner

Tauscher  
Taylor (MS)  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Towns  
Turner (TX)  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Van Hollen  
Velazquez  
Visclosky  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Wexler  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Wynn

## NOT VOTING—5

Cox  
Gephardt  
McInnis  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE) (during the vote). Members are reminded there are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1453

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 322, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION  
OF H.R. 2559, MILITARY CON-  
STRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS  
ACT, 2004

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 298 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

## H. RES. 298

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2559) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bills shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and re-

port the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto the final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Last night, the Committee on Rules met and granted an open rule for H.R. 2559, the Fiscal Year 2004 Military Construction Appropriations Act.

The United States military is clearly the best in the world. The young men and women in our Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, and Coast Guard are thoroughly dedicated and patriotic professionals, the best our Nation has to offer. We are asking a lot from our military today. Our personnel on active duty know that they may well be deployed overseas and, perhaps, on dangerous missions. So we want to provide them a quality of life for themselves and their families that will allow them to serve, knowing that their families will be taken care of with good housing and good health care.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2559 recognizes the dedication and commitment of our troops by providing for their most basic needs: improved military facilities, including the previously mentioned housing and medical facilities.

□ 1500

Mr. Speaker, we must honor the most basic commitments we have made to the men and women of our Armed Services. We must ensure a reasonable quality of life to recruit and retain the best and brightest for America's fighting forces. Most importantly, we must do it all, everything in our power to ensure a strong, able, dedicated American military so this Nation will be ever vigilant, ever prepared, so much more important now than it has been in the past.

This bill provides nearly \$1.2 billion for barracks, and \$176 million for hospitals and medical facilities for our troops and their families. It also provides \$2.7 billion to operate and maintain existing housing units, and \$1.2 billion for new housing units, much, much needed.

Military families also have a tremendous need for quality child care, especially single parents and families in which one or both parents may face lengthy deployment. To help meet this need, the bill provides \$16 million for child development centers. H.R. 2559 is more than just a signal to our soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines that this Nation recognizes their services and their sacrifice. It is a means by which we meet our commitment to providing

## NOES—203

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Alexander  
Allen  
Andrews  
Baca  
Baird  
Baldwin  
Ballance  
Becerra  
Bell  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (OH)  
Brown, Corrine  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardin  
Cardoza  
Carson (IN)  
Carson (OK)  
Case  
Clay  
Clyburn  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costello  
Cramer  
Crowley  
Cubin  
Cumming  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (FL)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (TN)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt

DeLauro  
Deutsch  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dooley (CA)  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Emanuel  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Evans  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Ford  
Frank (MA)  
Frost  
Gonzalez  
Gordon  
Green (TX)  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Hill  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hoeffel  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hooley (OR)  
Hoyer  
Inslee  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
John  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones (OH)  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy (RI)

Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind  
Kleczka  
Kucinich  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Lucas (KY)  
Lynch  
Majette  
Maloney  
Markey  
Marshall  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Menendez  
Michaud  
Millender-  
McDonald  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Mollohan  
Moore  
Moran (VA)  
Murtha  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)

them a decent quality of life so as to sustain the commitment and professionalism of America's all voluntary armed services and the families that support them.

While our men and women in uniform have swiftly dispatched our enemies abroad, they face increasingly complex personal and professional challenges here at home. We must do more to take care of those who are putting their lives on the line to defend our freedoms, and for the families who support them in their efforts. And I am really glad we are getting this done before we head home for the July 4th work break.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and to support the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 6½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the rule under consideration for H.R. 2559, the Fiscal Year 2004 Military Construction Appropriations Act, is an open rule. It provides for one hour of general debate, waives all points of order against consideration of the bill, allows for germane amendments and provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my appreciation for the work of the gentleman from Michigan (Chairman KNOLLENBERG) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) of the Subcommittee on Military Construction along with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for continuing the tradition of bipartisan action on this bill and for doing the best with a terrible allocation.

Mr. Speaker, I have a terrible feeling of *deja vu*. Almost exactly 1 year ago, on June 27 of 2002, I stood on this House floor as the minority manager of the rule on the fiscal year 2003 military construction bill. Along with the then-chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER), we all bemoaned the inadequacy of that bill. We all pledged to do better next year and called upon President Bush to increase the budget for desperately needed military construction, housing, base realignment and base closure.

Well, 1 year later none of that has happened. In fact, this year is even worse. If last year's appropriations bill was inadequate, this one is woefully inadequate, to quote the gentleman from Michigan (Chairman KNOLLENBERG). In fact, the fiscal year 2004 bill is \$1.5 billion less than last year's bill. Let me repeat that. This bill is \$1.5 billion less than the fiscal year 2003 funding levels. It is even \$41 million less than the chairman's request.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues what in the world are we doing? How can we stand on this House floor day after day, week after week and declare how much we support our uniformed men and women when the funding provided for family housing in this bill is \$270 million less than last year? How can we stand on the floor of this House day after day, week after week and say that we are engaged in a long-term struggle against a global enemy when funding for military construction in this bill is \$1 billion less than last year?

Mr. Speaker, poor facility conditions are not only unsafe, they hamper readiness and decrease troop retention. According to the Pentagon, 180,000 of the 300,000 units of military housing are substandard. According to the Pentagon, 68 percent of the Department's facilities have deficiencies so serious that they might impede mission readiness or they are so deteriorated that they cannot support mission requirements. The current reductions in funding for construction in these facility categories means that the rate at which buildings are renovated or replaced has just increased from 83 years to 150 years.

This is a national scandal. And let us be clear, this bill is not only about new housing, it is about the operation and maintenance of existing family housing. One of the few increases in family housing in this bill is for the Army. It receives an \$81 million increase. Unfortunately, funding for the operation and maintenance of existing Army family housing is cut by \$63 million, allowing more and more current housing units to deteriorate and fall into substandard condition. Talk about robbing Peter to pay Paul.

Mr. Speaker, I keep hearing that since the events of September 11 we live in a changed world. I keep on hearing how much we appreciate our Armed Forces, how much we appreciate their sacrifice and service. Then why do we keep cutting and cutting and cutting the military construction appropriations bill? We obviously do not appreciate them enough to give them decent housing. We obviously do not admire them enough to give them quality facilities. Are we going to be on the floor of this House next year expressing our disappointment over how inadequate the military construction appropriations bill is again?

Now, I have been told that we should just wait until the 2005 round of base closings, then we will see some modest increases for housing at the bases that survive the next round of closures. That is as cynical a rationalization as I have ever heard. Do we honestly believe that inadequate housing and facilities exist only on bases likely to be closed down?

Mr. Speaker, this crisis in funding for family housing and military construction is nationwide. It exists at nearly every single base and installation across the land and overseas, and it af-

fects every branch of our Armed Forces. And if base closure is somehow magically supposed to balance the ledgers, then why are we in such a housing and construction crisis right now?

It does not have to be this way, Mr. Speaker, and there is a remedy. The ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), tried to provide an extra \$958 million above the allocation level for military construction and housing. His solution is not hard to accept. This House would simply scale back 5 percent of the scheduled tax cut for people with adjusted gross incomes of over \$1 million for 1 year. This would mean that the tax refund for these individuals would be reduced from about \$88,000 to \$83,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, according to the most recent census, there are more than 280 million people in the United States. This modest change in the tax cut would affect about 200,000 individuals, or less than one-tenth of 1 percent of all taxpayers. Such a small adjustment, however, would provide nearly a billion dollars to help ensure that more than 1.4 million men and women who serve our country on active duty have decent housing and workplaces for themselves and their families. But the Republicans on the Committee on Appropriations rejected the gentleman from Wisconsin's (Mr. OBEY) proposal, and last night the Republicans on the Committee on Rules refused to allow the gentleman from Wisconsin's (Mr. OBEY) amendment to even be debated and voted on in this House.

So we are faced with the results of what happens when we rob our Nation of the most basic revenue needed to adequately fund our Nation's priorities. We rob our valiant military personnel of decent homes and facilities. We rob our veterans of their basic benefits. We cut back funding for schools and child care for military families. And we are faced with passing this woefully inadequate bill, a bill I believe that for all the hard work of the gentleman from Michigan (Chairman KNOLLENBERG) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), can only be viewed as a shameful scandal on the part of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 9 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Appropriations.

(Mr. OBEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, it would be so nice if the force of our rhetoric is matched by the force of our deeds. That certainly is not the case with this bill.

Just a few months ago this House passed this resolution and it said,

among other things, "Resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring, that the Congress express the unequivocal support and appreciation of the Nation to the members of the United States Armed Forces serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom who are carrying out their missions with excellence, patriotism and bravery and also to their families."

Well, the sad news, unfortunately, is that the check is not in the mail. We have given them a resolution but we are short-sheeting them in terms of things that military families need in order to make their life better. I do not understand why we are doing that. This bill shows the House's "support and appreciation" by providing \$1.5 billion less than we appropriated last year to provide the military with decent housing and work places.

The bill also thanks the military supposedly by cutting the President's own request for the Pentagon by \$180 million. This is for hangers, offices, fitness centers and teaching facilities that even OMB and the administration said the military needed. But this bill cuts them out.

Many Members of this House have seen the problems for themselves. The Pentagon itself rates the readiness of most military facilities as marginal or worse. Over 225,000 service members and their families cannot get decent barracks or decent housing. This bill is not up to the job and we all know why. It is not the fault of the subcommittee chairman. It is the fault of every single Member of this House who voted for the budget resolution which said that the only priorities for this year was going to be tax cuts. And as you know, the lion's share of the tax cuts went into the pockets of the most wealthy 1 percent of people in this country.

So as a result of that decision by the Republican leadership to put tax cuts as the primary goal of this Congress, the budget resolution, for instance, that was passed is on track to cut \$28 billion from veterans benefits. There would be, under the White House budget, \$200 million in cuts to impact aid to the school districts that educate the children of military families. As many as 230,000 military families have been cut out of the low income child tax provision.

We are taking millionaires off the tax roll, but we are not giving the people who need the help the most anything but table scraps on the tax side.

The defense bill, which was marked up this morning in full committee, will cut raises for the most junior enlisted and officer personnel from the 4.1 percent they have been expecting to just 2 percent. I want to see how many of you who have cried about the fact that you have Army personnel on food stamps, I want to see how many of you vote to cut that. I want to watch that.

A realistic budget resolution has been beyond the reach of the Congress, and this is the result as we are seeing today. Now, I want to be able to offer

an amendment to correct the problem. My amendment would reinstate the \$160 million in cuts from the President's budget. I would like to restore all of them. I think the White House is right. We need them. I would also add \$480 million for family housing. That would help at least 2,500 military families. That would be a useful first step in replacing the 134,000 inadequate units that service members and their families are forced to live in today.

Finally, the amendment would provide \$318 million for new barracks that would help 5,300 single service members into decent housing. The Pentagon says we need over 83,000 units, so even this amendment goes just an inch. My amendment is an opportunity to restore the projects the President said were needed, to help about 8,000 service members and their families, and it would help Congress to keep its promise to the troops.

Now, as the gentleman from Massachusetts has indicated, I would pay for it by changing the tax package that was just passed by this Congress. What I would say is that for persons with adjusted gross incomes of more than \$1 million, instead of their getting the \$88,000 tax cut they will get next year, we would cut that to \$83,000. That is hardly starvation wages. Now, these are not just millionaires. These are people with adjusted gross incomes of more than \$1 million each year, about 200,000 people in this society. And I bet if you asked them, they would say they would happily take that reduction in order to provide a real improvement in the quality of life for our troops.

□ 1515

We are saying let them keep 95 percent of their tax cut but use that \$5,000 difference to give people who are putting their lives on the line for this country better living conditions.

I do not know if you saw the article in the "Army Times" June 30, 2003. Mr. Speaker, I will insert this article in the RECORD immediately after my remarks.

I would also like to read you two paragraphs from a news story today out of The New York Times. It reads as follows: "The 400 wealthiest taxpayers who accounted for more than 1 percent of all income in the United States in the year 2000 more than doubled their share from 8 years earlier, but their tax burden plummeted over that same period of time."

The article then goes on to say why, and then it says that "had President Bush's latest tax cuts been in effect in 2000, the average tax bill for the top 400 earners in the country would have been about \$30.4 million, a savings of \$8.3 million, or more than a fifth."

Now, when we are in tough times, we have to ask, in my judgment, who needs help the most. I think that decent military housing ought to come before \$88,000 tax cuts for the most comfortable people in this society. We are not saying cut them out. We are

simply saying shave them back by 5 percent.

Our problem is, we will not even be able to offer this amendment on the floor today because the Committee on Rules said, "No way, baby." So that means that once again, the Republican majority is able to hide behind its budget resolution which did not specify where the cuts would come from in order to pay for the tax cuts.

We have a serious problem in this House. The budget process is supposed to force the Congress to make choices, to recognize trade-offs, and explicitly make those choices in full view of the country. Instead, the budget process is being used in conjunction with the rules out of the Committee on Rules to deny the public the understanding of what the costs are from those tax cuts. So they get to think that they are cost-free.

They do not know, for instance, that they will cost the public an extra \$27 billion in interest payments next year. If we could take just \$10 billion of that extra interest payment, we could take care of the shortcomings in education, in health care, in military housing, and every other appropriation bill that comes before us. That is what we would do if we had any sense of common sense. That is what we would do if we had any sense of justice.

I urge you to vote against the previous question on the rule so that we can offer the amendment that I have just described.

[From the Army Times, June 30, 2003]

#### NOTHING BUT LIP SERVICE

In recent months, President Bush and the Republican-controlled Congress have missed no opportunity to heap richly deserved praise on the military. But talk is cheap—and getting cheaper by the day, judging from the nickel-and-dime treatment the troops are getting lately.

For example, the White House griped that various pay-and-benefits incentives added to the 2004 defense budget by Congress are wasteful and unnecessary—including a modest proposal to double the \$6,000 gratuity paid to families of troops who die on active duty. This comes at a time when Americans continue to die in Iraq at a rate of about one a day.

Similarly, the administration announced that on Oct. 1 it wants to roll back recent modest increases in monthly imminent-danger pay (from \$225 to \$150) and family-separation allowance (from \$250 to \$100) for troops getting shot at in combat zones.

Then there's military tax relief—or the lack thereof. As Bush and Republican leaders in Congress preach the mantra of tax cuts, they can't seem to find time to make progress on minor tax provisions that would be a boon to military homeowners, reservists who travel long distances for training and parents deployed to combat zones, among others.

Incredibly, one of those tax provisions—easing residency rules for service members to qualify for capital-gains exemptions when selling a home—has been a homeless orphan in the corridors of power for more than five years now.

The chintz even extends to basic pay. While Bush's proposed 2004 defense budget would continue higher targeted raises for some ranks, he also proposed capping raises

for E-1s, E-2s and O-1s at 2 percent, well below the average raise of 4.1 percent.

The Senate version of the defense bill rejects that idea, and would provide minimum 3.7 percent raises for all and higher targeted hikes for some. But the House version of the bill goes along with Bush, making this an issue still to be hashed out in upcoming negotiations.

All of which brings us to the latest indignity—Bush's \$9.2 billion military construction request for 2004, which was set a full \$1.5 billion below this year's budget on the expectation that Congress, as has become tradition in recent years, would add funding as it drafted the construction appropriations bill.

But Bush's tax cuts have left little elbow room in the 2004 federal budget that is taking shape, and the squeeze is on across the board.

The result: Not only has the House Appropriations military construction panel accepted Bush's proposed \$1.5 billion cut, it voted to reduce construction spending by an additional \$41 million next year.

Rep. David Obey, D-Wis., senior Democrat on the House Appropriations Committee, took a stab at restoring \$1 billion of the \$1.5 billion cut in Bush's construction budget. He proposed to cover that cost by trimming recent tax cuts for the roughly 200,000 Americans who earn more than \$1 million a year. Instead of a tax break of \$88,300, they would receive \$83,500.

The Republican majority on the construction appropriations panel quickly shot Obey down. And so the outlook for making progress next year in tackling the huge backlog of work that needs to be done on crumbling military housing and other facilities is bleak at best.

Taken piecemeal, all these corner-cutting moves might be viewed as mere flesh wounds. But even flesh wounds are fatal if you suffer enough of them. It adds up to a troubling pattern that eventually will hurt morale—especially if the current breakneck operations tempo also rolls on unchecked and the tense situations in Iraq and Afghanistan do not ease.

Rep. Chet Edwards, D-Texas, who notes that the House passed a resolution in March pledging "unequivocal support" to service members and their families, puts it this way: "American military men and women don't deserve to be saluted with our words and insulted by our actions."

Translation: Money talks—and we all know what walks.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), who has worked very hard on this bill.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the majority leader of this House, said that in time of war nothing is more important than tax cuts. Well, this bill proves it. Because of the tax cuts, including dividend tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans, because of the \$88,000 tax cut that every American on average making over \$1 million a year will receive, we now bring a bill to this House that should be an embarrassment to the Members of Congress who stood on this floor and said we should honor our servicemen and -women.

I noted the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) a few minutes ago said this bill is more than a signal to our servicemen and -women. Well, I agree. It is a flashing red light. It says

that while we honor you with our words, we cut your quality of life programs with our deeds and with our votes. Yes, it is more than a signal. This bill is a slap in the face to every serviceman and -woman, every military child in America who this year and in years past has made tremendous sacrifices, including the sacrifice of life, to defend our country and our way of life.

The dollar figures in this bill are not the fault of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), the great chairman of this subcommittee, of which I am the ranking member. He did the very best any human could do to fairly put together the highest list of priorities given the woefully inadequate funding in this bill; but let us tell the American people, Mr. Speaker, like it is. They deserve the truth and so do our servicemen and -women.

What this Republican leadership in Congress this year has said is that it is more important to give a person making more than \$1 million dollar a year an \$88,000 tax cut rather than an \$83,000 tax cut. It is more important to do that than it is to provide adequate housing and day care and health clinics and training ranges for our brave servicemen and -women, many of whom are serving in Iraq today.

Let us be clear. What this House leadership is saying is that while we salute our troops as they get on the airplane to fly to Iraq or Afghanistan and risk their lives for us, we are handing them a slip saying the administration wants to cut their children's education funding and the IMPACT aid program; and on the very night of March 21 when we voted to salute our troops in Iraq, 8 minutes later the House Republican majority voted to cut those troops' future veterans benefits by \$28 billion. There is a clear record here; and, yes, it is a clear signal to our servicemen and -women.

It is that we are going to cut your benefits, your housing, your children's education, your day care clinics, your health facilities in order to pay for the promise of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), who said that in time of war, nothing is more important than tax cuts.

Unfortunately, the vast majority of the 44,000 Army soldiers that I have the privilege to represent at Fort Hood in Texas will not get anything or very little at all out of those tax cuts, while the millionaires will average, not the millionaires but the people making over \$1 million a year will average more than \$88,000 in tax cuts.

How serious is the housing problem for our servicemen and -women? Maybe they already have quality housing. Perhaps there is some Member of this House or some member of the public, Mr. Speaker, that has not visited our military installations recently. Maybe they think they live in the lap of luxury. Let me present the facts.

The fact is that there are 83,000 servicemen and -women living in inad-

equated barracks that do not even meet the lowest Department of Defense standards. The truth is that there are 128,860 military families, people that on this floor just a few minutes ago were called professional, the best, clearly dedicated, 128,000 of those families are now living in housing that does not meet very low DOD standards.

By the way, just for the record, let me point out what is defined as meeting the quality standard required by the Department of Defense. In the Navy that means that \$15,000 could fix up your house where it could meet those lowest minimum DOD standards and you are living in adequate housing. Forget the fact that you may never get that \$15,000 to fix your leaky roof or to fix the washer and dryer that are not working or to repair the damage to the structure of the house. If \$15,000 would fix it, even if you never get that money to fix that house, you are living in adequate housing.

The truth is, as the gentlewoman from North Carolina said, we ask a lot from our servicemen and -women; and I stand in this House today to say that this bill, despite the tremendous, valiant efforts of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) who did the best anybody could with the amount of money given to him, this bill is a slap in the face to our servicemen and -women; and just as the "Army Times" in its editorial recently said that our soldiers are in effect getting tired of lip service from Congress, this bill salutes them by insulting them.

It defines our rhetoric of appreciation with the reality of a \$1.5 billion cut in important programs that would have meant a better quality of life, better training so that many of our troops might come home safely to the hugs of their families rather than in body bags.

What this House is saying, despite all the intentions that one might have, good or bad, what this House is saying with our votes is that we value more an \$88,000 tax cut for millionaires, those making more than \$1 million, more than them getting an \$83,000 tax cut, we value that more than treating with respect our servicemen and -women.

We should oppose this rule, support the Obey amendment, and back up our rhetoric with our actions.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I will close for our side.

Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for their eloquent and powerful words and for reminding us all how we are not living up to our promise to our uniformed men and women, and it is something that every single Member in this House should listen to very carefully; and we now have an opportunity to be able to do something about that.

Mr. Speaker, I will ask for a recorded vote on the previous question, and I will urge Members to vote "no" on the

previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the rule that will make in order the Obey amendment to restore funding for military construction programs. This amendment was submitted to the Committee on Rules and rejected by the Republican majority.

The bill provides \$9.2 billion for military construction spending. That is \$41 million below the level requested by the President, and \$1.5 billion less than last year. As we have said over and over, even the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, called the bill woefully underfunded.

This amendment will help restore some of these desperately needed additional funds. It will provide an additional \$958 million above the subcommittee's allocation. This would be offset by reducing the 2004 tax cut for 200,000 millionaires from \$88,000 to \$83,000. That is it.

Mr. Speaker, whether or not Members are Republicans or Democrats, they should be extremely concerned, in fact outraged, about the lack of adequate funding for the programs that help our men and women in the military. The Obey amendment would help fix that and do so with no additional cost to the deficit.

Our rhetoric is simply not enough, Mr. Speaker. If we want to honor our uniformed men and women then we should not be cutting their benefits and their programs. We should be providing them what they need.

So I will urge Members on both sides of the aisle to vote "no" on the previous question. Let me emphasize that a "no" vote will not stop the House from taking up the military construction appropriations bill. However, a "yes" vote will prevent the House from considering the Obey amendment to help restore funding for this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment and extraneous materials immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, again, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The material previously referred to by the gentleman from Massachusetts is as follows:

PREVIOUS QUESTION FOR H. RES. 298—RULE ON H.R. 2559 FISCAL YEAR 2004 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

"SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the amendment printed in section 3 shall be in order without intervention of any point of order and before any other amendment if offered by Representative Obey of Wisconsin or a designee. The amendment is not subject to amendment

except for pro forma amendments or to a demand for a division of the question in the committee of the whole or in the House.

"SEC. 3. The amendment referred to in section 2 is as follows:

On page 2, line 13, under the heading "Military Construction, Army", delete the dollar amount and insert \$1,726,660,000;

On page 3, line 13, under the heading "Military Construction, Navy", delete the dollar amount and insert \$1,311,907,000;

On page 4, line 5, under the heading "Military Construction, Air Force", delete the dollar amount and insert \$968,509,000;

On page 4, line 21, under the heading "Military Construction, Defense-Wide", delete the dollar amount and insert \$872,110,000;

On page 5, line 20, under the heading "Military Construction, Army National Guard", delete the dollar amount and insert \$231,860,000;

On page 6, line 3, under the heading "Military Construction Air National Guard", delete the dollar amount and insert \$95,605,000;

On page 7, line 19, under the heading "Family Housing Construction, Army", delete the dollar amount and insert \$601,191,000;

On page 8, line 13, under the heading "Family Housing Construction, Navy and Marine Corps", delete the dollar amount and insert \$288,193,000;

And on page 9, line 6, under the heading "Family Housing Construction, Air Force", delete the dollar amount and insert \$841,065,000.

At the end of the bill, add the following:

Section . In the case of taxpayers with adjusted gross income tax excess of \$1,000,000 for the tax year beginning in 2003, the amount of tax reduction resulting from enactment of the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003 shall be reduced by five percent.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 200, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 324]

YEAS—220

Aderholt	Bishop (UT)	Burns
Akin	Blackburn	Burr
Bachus	Blunt	Burton (IN)
Baker	Boehert	Buyer
Ballenger	Boehner	Calvert
Barrett (SC)	Bonilla	Camp
Bartlett (MD)	Bonner	Cannon
Barton (TX)	Bono	Cantor
Bass	Boozman	Capito
Beauprez	Bradley (NH)	Carter
Bereuter	Brady (TX)	Castle
Biggett	Brown (SC)	Chabot
Billirakis	Burgess	Chocola

Coble	Isakson	Pryce (OH)
Cole	Issa	Putnam
Collins	Istook	Quinn
Cox	Janklow	Radanovich
Crane	Jenkins	Ramstad
Crenshaw	Johnson (CT)	Regula
Culberson	Johnson (IL)	Rehberg
Cunningham	Johnson, Sam	Renzi
Davis, Jo Ann	Jones (NC)	Reynolds
Davis, Tom	Keller	Rogers (AL)
Deal (GA)	Kelly	Rogers (KY)
DeLay	Kennedy (MN)	Rogers (MI)
DeMint	King (IA)	Rohrabacher
Diaz-Balart, L.	King (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kingston	Royce
Doolittle	Kirk	Ryan (WI)
Dreier	Kline	Ryun (KS)
Duncan	Knollenberg	Saxton
Dunn	Kolbe	Schrock
Ehlers	LaHood	Sensenbrenner
Emerson	Latham	Sessions
English	LaTourette	Shadegg
Everett	Leach	Shaw
Feeney	Lewis (KY)	Shays
Ferguson	Linder	Sherwood
Flake	LoBiondo	Shimkus
Fletcher	Lucas (OK)	Shuster
Foley	Manzullo	Simmons
Forbes	McCotter	Simpson
Fossella	McCrery	Smith (MI)
Franks (AZ)	McHugh	Smith (NJ)
Frelinghuysen	McKeon	Smith (TX)
Gallegly	Mica	Souder
Garrett (NJ)	Miller (FL)	Sullivan
Gerlach	Miller (MI)	Sweeney
Gibbons	Miller, Gary	Tancredo
Gilchrest	Moran (KS)	Tauzin
Gillmor	Murphy	Taylor (NC)
Gingrey	Musgrave	Terry
Goode	Myrick	Thomas
Goodlatte	Nethercutt	Thornberry
Goss	Neugebauer	Tiahrt
Granger	Ney	Tiberti
Graves	Northup	Toomey
Green (WI)	Norwood	Turner (OH)
Greenwood	Nunes	Upton
Gutknecht	Nussle	Vitter
Harris	Osborne	Walden (OR)
Hart	Ose	Walsh
Hastings (WA)	Otter	Wamp
Hayes	Oxley	Weldon (FL)
Hayworth	Pearce	Weldon (PA)
Hefley	Pence	Weller
Hensarling	Peterson (PA)	Whitfield
Hobson	Petri	Wicker
Hoekstra	Pickering	Wilson (NM)
Hostettler	Pitts	Wilson (SC)
Houghton	Platts	Wolf
Hulshof	Pombo	Young (FL)
Hunter	Porter	
Hyde	Portman	

NAYS—200

Abercrombie	Crowley	Hinchey
Ackerman	Cummings	Hinojosa
Alexander	Davis (AL)	Hoefel
Allen	Davis (CA)	Holden
Andrews	Davis (FL)	Holt
Baca	Davis (IL)	Honda
Baird	Davis (TN)	Hooley (OR)
Baldwin	DeFazio	Hoyer
Ballance	DeGette	Inslee
Becerra	Delahunt	Israel
Bell	DeLauro	Jackson (IL)
Berkley	Deutsch	Jackson-Lee
Berman	Dicks	(TX)
Berry	Dingell	John
Bishop (GA)	Doggett	Johnson, E. B.
Bishop (NY)	Doyle	Jones (OH)
Blumenauer	Edwards	Kanjorski
Boswell	Emanuel	Kaptur
Boucher	Engel	Kennedy (RI)
Boyd	Eshoo	Kildee
Brady (PA)	Etheridge	Kilpatrick
Brown (OH)	Farr	Kind
Brown, Corrine	Fattah	Klecza
Capps	Filner	Kucinich
Capuano	Ford	Lampson
Cardin	Frank (MA)	Langevin
Cardoza	Frost	Lantos
Carson (IN)	Gonzalez	Larsen (WA)
Carson (OK)	Gordon	Larson (CT)
Case	Green (TX)	Lee
Clay	Grijalva	Levin
Clyburn	Gutierrez	Lewis (GA)
Conyers	Hall	Lipinski
Cooper	Harman	Lofgren
Costello	Hastings (FL)	Lowey
Cramer	Hill	Lucas (KY)

Lynch	Olver	Sherman
Majette	Ortiz	Skelton
Maloney	Owens	Slaughter
Markey	Pallone	Snyder
Marshall	Pascrell	Solis
Matheson	Pastor	Spratt
Matsui	Payne	Stark
McCarthy (MO)	Pelosi	Stenholm
McCarthy (NY)	Peterson (MN)	Strickland
McCollum	Pomeroy	Stupak
McDermott	Price (NC)	Tanner
McGovern	Rahall	Tauscher
McIntyre	Rangel	Taylor (MS)
McNulty	Reyes	Thompson (CA)
Meehan	Rodriguez	Thompson (MS)
Meek (FL)	Ross	Tierney
Meeks (NY)	Rothman	Towns
Menendez	Roybal-Allard	Turner (TX)
Michaud	Ruppersberger	Udall (CO)
Millender-	Rush	Udall (NM)
McDonald	Ryan (OH)	Van Hollen
Miller (NC)	Sabo	Velazquez
Miller, George	Sanchez, Linda	Visclosky
Mollohan	T.	Waters
Moore	Sanchez, Loretta	Watt
Moran (VA)	Sanders	Waxman
Murtha	Sandlin	Weiner
Nadler	Schakowsky	Wexler
Napolitano	Schiff	Woolsey
Neal (MA)	Scott (GA)	Wu
Oberstar	Scott (VA)	Wynn
Obey	Serrano	

## NOT VOTING—14

Brown-Waite,	Gephardt	Paul
Ginny	Herger	Smith (WA)
Cubin	Jefferson	Stearns
Dooley (CA)	Lewis (CA)	Watson
Evans	McInnis	Young (AK)

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE) (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1551

Mr. GORDON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, JULY 3, 2003, TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight, July 3, 2003, to file a privileged report, making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1 of rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their re-

marks, and that I be permitted to include tabular and extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 2559.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 298 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2559.

□ 1553

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2559) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, with Mr. BASS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG).

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. KNOLLENBERG asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to present to the House H.R. 2559, the fiscal year 2004 military construction appropriations bill. This legislation provides funds for all types of construction projects on military installations here in the U.S. and abroad. Projects range from barracks and housing to training ranges and runways.

I would like to thank my ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), for his advice and support and cooperation in producing this recommendation. He has been a good partner, and I appreciate having the gentleman there to work together on this bill.

I would also like to express my appreciation to all members of the subcommittee for their help in putting together this year's bill. I commend the good work done by the subcommittee staff, Tom Forhan, Brian Potts, Mary Arnold, Kim Reath, and Valerie Baldwin. This has made my transition to chairman an easy one. I want to thank my personal staff, Jeff Onizuk and Lieutenant Commander Scott Gray. I appreciate the long hours they have put in making this the best bill possible.

The bill presented today totals \$9.196 billion, which complies with the 302(b) allocation for both budget authority and outlays. This recommendation is, however, \$41 million below the President's request, a reduction of less than 1/2 of 1 percent. Excluding funds provided in response to the global war on terrorism and Operation Iraqi Freedom, the bill is \$605 million or 6 percent below fiscal year 2003 enacted levels.

For the first time in recent memory, this subcommittee has produced a recommendation that is below the President's request. This is the hand that we were dealt under current budgetary constraints, and we have tried to deal with it in as fair a manner as possible.

I assure Members the committee did due diligence to find as much savings as possible for the bill, and I believe we left no stone unturned in this process. This bill continues the subcommittee's bipartisan tradition of quality of life first for our service men and women. This is our paramount goal, and I believe we have reached it.

As many Members are aware, the Department of Defense is undertaking a privatization effort for military housing. For those of us who have seen the results thus far, this is an exciting development. What it means for the family housing account of this bill is that less money does not mean less housing. It means that we are getting more bang for our buck. For example, take the Residential Communities Initiative at the Presidio of Monterey. Using only the basic allowance for housing, the BAH, 2,168 new homes will be built and 41 historic units will be renovated. In addition, the private contractor will build wider roads, playgrounds, amenities such as community centers and swimming pools, and so on. What had been substandard housing will become an enviable community for our military families, and it will come at no cost, no cost to the family housing account in this bill.

The bottom line is that the funding in this bill does not slow down the effort to revitalize our military family housing. In fact, that effort is accelerating because of this privatization initiative.

I would like to take a moment to highlight some key areas in the bill. First, \$1.24 billion is provided for troop barracks. This is a \$62 million increase from last year's level. This sends a positive message to our unaccompanied personnel stationed all around the world that their quality of life is a priority.

The bill includes \$194 million for hospital and medical facilities, an increase of \$25 million above last year's level. This is another positive quality-of-life message, one intended for all service members as well as their families.

\$274 million is provided for community facilities, an increase of \$45 million above the President's request. These facilities include child development centers, fire stations, schools, and physical fitness centers.